

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**EDWARD JAMES CASH,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 4:22-cv-00075-O-BP**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (“FCR”) of the United States Magistrate Judge and any objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the undersigned District Judge believes that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court.

This dispute involves the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration’s denial of Plaintiff’s application for Supplemental Security Income. The Commissioner ultimately denied Plaintiff benefits upon a finding, confirmed by an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”), that Plaintiff is not disabled. Upon review, the Magistrate Judge confirms that denial of benefits and recommends that the undersigned affirm the Commissioner’s decision and dismiss Plaintiff’s case with prejudice.

Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge’s FCR on the grounds that the ALJ’s decision is not supported by substantial evidence in the record and, specifically, that the ALJ improperly weighed the opinions of Plaintiff’s treating medical professionals. Pl.’s Objection 4–6, ECF No.

24. Having reviewed Plaintiff's objections and the Magistrate's FCR *de novo*, the undersigned holds that there is substantial relevant evidence in the record that a reasonable mind might accept to support the ALJ's conclusion regarding Plaintiff's eligibility for benefits. *Ripley v. Chater*, 67 F.3d 552, 555 (5th Cir. 1995). Here, the Court finds that the ALJ made "credible evidentiary choices" in support of her decision. *Boyd v. Apfel*, 239 F.3d 689, 704 (5th Cir. 2001). Thus, the Magistrate Judge did not err in his findings, conclusion, or recommendation that this Court should affirm the Commissioner's decision and dismiss this case with prejudice.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the Commissioner's decision should be **AFFIRMED** and Plaintiff's case **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

**SO ORDERED** on this **13th day of January, 2023**.

  
Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE